

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The above-identified patent application has been amended and reconsideration and re-examination are hereby requested.

Claims 5 and 9 stand rejected under 35 USC 103.

Claims 5 and 9 point out that each one of the input/output sections includes a queue for outbound information being returned to the source through such originating one of the directors after being processed by the microprocessor of such *remote one of the directors*.

Thus, as pointed out in the claims, each one of the input/output sections includes a queue for outbound information being returned to the **SOURCE** (SUCH AS THE HOST COMPUTER/SERVER OR DISK DRIVES, as the case may be) through such *originating one of the directors* after being processed by the microprocessor of such *remote one of the DIRECTORS*. This is not described in Calvignac (U. S. Patent No. 6,044,079) as acknowledged by the Examiner and is respectfully submitted that it is not described or suggested in Pierson (USP 2003/0048781).

That is, it is respectfully submitted that in Pierson the queue is NOT IN THE MICROPROCESSOR OF THE REMOTE ONE OF **THE DIRECTORS**. Thus, in Pierson, information is not returned to the source through such originating one of the *directors after being processed by the microprocessor of such remote one of the directors*.

In the event a petition for extension of time is required by this paper and not otherwise provided, such petition is hereby made and authorization is provided herewith to charge deposit account No. 05-0889 for the cost of such extension.

May 29, 2008
Date

Respectfully submitted,
/richard sharkansky/
Richard M. Sharkansky
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No.: 25,800
P. O. Box 557
Mashpee, MA 02649
Telephone: (508) 477-4311
Facsimile: (508) 477-7234